

**TOWN OF GILBERT
PLANNING COMMISSION - STUDY SESSION**

**Council Chambers
50 E. Civic Center Drive, Gilbert, AZ
November 6, 2019**

COMMISSION PRESENT:

Brian Andersen, Chair
Carl Bloomfield, Vice Chair
David Cavenue
Noah Mundt
Scott September
Jän Simon
Les Smith
Nathan Mackin, Alternate

COMMISSION ABSENT:

Philip Alibrandi, Alternate

COUNCIL LIAISON:

Brigette Peterson, Absent

STAFF PRESENT:

Sydney Bethel, Planner II
Stephanie Bubenheim, Planner II
Keith Newman, Planner II
Josh Rogers, Planner II
Amy Temes, Senior Planner
Eva Cutro, Planning Division Manager
Nancy Davidson, Assistant Town Attorney

RECORDER:

Dana Desing

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Andersen called the November 6, 2019 Study Session of the Planning Commission to order at 5:00 p.m.

1. ST19-08 THE VILLAS AT SOMERSET: Seven (7) new Standard Plans by Capital West Homes for 68 Lots on approximately 20 acres generally located east of the southeast corner of Pecos Road and Greenfield Road and zoned Single Family Attached (SF-A).

Planner Keith Newman presented ST19-08 The Villas at Somerset Standard Plans by Capital West Homes. The site is located east of the Gilbert Temple along Pecos Road. The site was previously zoned Single Family Attached (SF-A) and a preplat was approved earlier this year. The site consists of approximately 20 acres and the applicant is proposing seven (7) new Standard Plans on 68 lots. The average lot size is 47.5' by 112' or 5,300 SF. Since the staff report was submitted, the applicant has provided revised information addressing some of the staff comments and the addition of a Modern Farmhouse architectural style. The proposal is for three standalone and four duplex plans with six color schemes. The average home size ranges from 3,800 to 5,400 SF of livable space, each with a two-car garage. The elevation matrix provided in the packet does not show the recently added Modern Farmhouse style, which will be included in the second review by staff. The building materials include stucco, brick and stone veneer, board and batten siding, concrete roof tiles, wood shutters, false dormers, and entryway towers. The six color schemes are fairly similar to each other by design. All of the staff comments and concerns are listed in the staff report. Staff had concerns regarding the visual impact of the front-loaded garages, rear roofline, and the variation between some of the elevations. Staff felt the 2198 Formal Med. 1A and 1B duplex and the 2500 Formal Med. 1A and 1B duplex elevations looked almost identical to each other. The applicant is working to address the staff comments to provide the required 20' long driveways. Staff was also concerned about the durability of the proposed fabric awnings in the Arizona sun. Mr. Newman

believed that concern may be addressed in the applicant's resubmittal. Staff is looking for input from the Planning Commission on those concerns.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION:

Commissioner Smith asked about the number of duplexes versus standalone plans. It appears that practically all of the elevations have front-loaded garages.

The applicant advised that there are 10 standalone lots proposed.

Mr. Newman stated they all have front-loaded garages due to the width of the lots. The 40-45' wide lots could not accommodate a side-loaded product. Staff had asked the applicant to look at that, although Mr. Newman did not believe the applicant was able to change that due to the size of the lots.

Commissioner September asked if the lots could not accommodate side-loaded garages, what other methodologies could be used to reduce the visual impact of the front-loaded garages from the street.

Mr. Newman stated there are some design standards that could potentially reduce the visual impact of those front-loaded garages. One option would be to deeply recess or stagger the garage doors. The proposed plans have front porches that extend forward, which will help to reduce the impact. Different types of driveway surfaces could also reduce the visual impact. Staff had provided suggestions to the applicant on reducing the visual impact and more information may be provided in the second review.

Commissioner Cavenee felt it was architecturally hard to recess the garage without impacting the functionality of the home given the narrowness of the lots. He felt elements of the home or patio were brought forward to equal or slightly pass that and he had no challenges with the front-loaded garages. He felt the design was a clean, streamlined look that was not encumbered by too much fluff while not being boring or plain. The balance of colors in the same family will make it look like a neighborhood. He agreed with staff's concern regarding the fabric awnings and felt that will be a sore point for users down the road with the Arizona sun. He encouraged something more permanent for the awnings.

Vice Chair Bloomfield noted that at the time this was approved for a preplat, the Commission was told it would be an open gated community with no fences. He wanted to confirm that there would be no side walls. It looks like it was designed so that the rear yards were open. He appreciated seeing all of the windows on the sides of the homes with 18' to 20' between homes and lots of landscaping.

Mr. Newman stated it will be a lock and leave with no side or rear yard fences. It will be open around each home to the open space.

Vice Chair Bloomfield stated it has the feel of high-end resort-style living and a clean look. He was not too concerned about there being multiple styles and felt that gives a theme to the whole development. He liked the design.

Chair Andersen asked if the patio dimensions of at least 6' was a requirement in the Land Development Code.

Mr. Newman stated that is a requirement. The applicant has submitted revised drawings to address that comment. The only other question he had for the Commission was whether the proposal could go forward with the additional Modern Farmhouse style and be approved administratively or if the Commission wanted to see this item again.

Chair Andersen confirmed that there was consensus of the Commission regarding the design of the project and that it could be approved administratively.

2. DR19-108 SUN VALLEY COMMUNITY CHURCH – SOUTH GILBERT: Site plan, landscaping, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, and colors and materials for approximately 10 acres, generally located at the northeast corner of Lindsay and Ocotillo Roads, and zoned Shopping Center (SC) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.

Planner Josh Rogers presented DR19-108 Sun Valley Community Church proposal for a new campus. The property is located at the northeast corner of Lindsay and Ocotillo Roads consisting of approximately 10 acres. Staff had no specific concerns and is looking for general input from the Commission. The Church will be focused towards the arterial corner and away from the surrounding residential. As part of the approval and per the ordinance, the applicant will complete the connection from Narrowleaf Drive to Porter Road in the residential subdivision. That land has already been dedicated. Overall, staff likes the design and layout of the site. The plans go above and beyond the minimum landscape requirements for the zoning district with 43% landscaping. Since this corner is adjacent to Chandler, the applicant will install a new Gilbert entry sign and staff felt they did a good job. The elevations provide a modern, sleek look with a good use of materials, colors and accents. The applicant is looking to move forward with CD's at risk and staff is requesting general input from the Commission on the proposal.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION:

Commissioner September thought it was a really interesting design and appreciated the effort that went into it. The perforated metal panels along the north and west elevations add some interesting variation to an otherwise big box of buildings. He liked how the classrooms were offset from the main worship area as well as the 40% landscaping. He appreciated that the retention area was separated from the parking lot and neighborhoods. He really liked the Welcome to Gilbert sign. Overall, he felt it was a well thought out design.

Commissioner Cavenee felt the proposal checks all of the boxes and he agreed on the comments. He felt it would be a very attractive building and the applicant did a great job turning a large structure into a very interesting exterior. He liked the placement on the site and felt it was very considerate of the neighbors. He would not mind seeing this proposal continue unhindered.

Chair Andersen confirmed that there was consensus of the Commission to place this item on the Consent Agenda for next month unless there are requests to speak on the item from the public.

3. GP19-011 THE MURPHY: Request for Minor General Plan Amendment to change the land use classification of approx. 1.5 gross acres generally located west of the northwest corner of Cooper and Guadalupe Roads from the Light Industrial (LI) to Community Commercial (CC).

Z19-23 THE MURPHY: Request to rezone approximately 1.5 gross acres of real property generally located west of the northwest corner of Cooper and Guadalupe Roads from the Light Industrial (LI) zoning district with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay to Community Commercial (CC) zoning district with a Planned Area Development overlay (PAD) overlay.

Planner Sydney Bethel reviewed GP19-011 and Z19-23, The Murphy. The subject site is approximately 1.5 gross acres located west of the northwest corner of Cooper and Guadalupe Roads. There are two requests before the Commission, a minor General Plan Amendment from Light Industrial (LI) to Community Commercial (CC), and a rezoning request from LI with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay to CC with a new PAD overlay. The reason for the requests is to allow retail and restaurant uses at the subject site. In the LI district, retail and restaurant are permitted with use restrictions. Rezoning to Community Commercial will allow for retail and restaurant without those specific restrictions.

With the new PAD, the applicant is requesting five deviations, four of which are for building and landscape setbacks. The front building setback and landscape setback are being reduced in order to develop the site in a

similar manner to the existing industrial development to the west that they will share access with. The rear setback is being reduced from 15' to 13' and the landscape setback is going from 15' to zero in order to bring the building closer to the railroad. A deviation is being requested from the 8' separation fence requirement. When the property is rezoned to Community Commercial, it will be adjacent to Light Industrial which will require an 8' separation fence. The applicant has designed the buildings to embrace the railroad tracks in a triangular shape.

A conceptual rendering was provided for reference only to give an idea of the type of development and design that the applicant will pursue going into the Design Review phase if the rezoning were to be approved.

Staff is requesting input on the development plan, the requested deviations, and general input on the proposal.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION:

Commissioner Cavenee understood that this will tie into the property to the west, which is great. The property to the west appears to have a zero setback to the railroad easement.

Ms. Bethel stated the property to the west does not have a zero setback. It should be a 15' setback. She will double check to verify that as the property was approved in 2006.

Commissioner Cavenee stated it looks like the stalls were abutting right along the same property boundary line as the subject site. He asked if the railroad tracks were elevated along Guadalupe and if there would be any concerns with visibility coming down Guadalupe Road.

Ms. Bethel will bring the item forward to Transportation with regard to ADA. She stated the applicant had advised that the landscape setback was zero, and it is zero for Light Industrial when adjacent to the PF/I (Public Facilities/Institutions) for the railroad track.

Commissioner Cavenee felt that would avoid an odd stagger. He felt the area may be fairly flat without any visibility issues. He felt there were a lot of requests for setback variations, although it is a very difficult and odd-shaped site. He was not opposed to any of the requests.

Vice Chair Bloomfield asked about the general thought behind the requirement for the 8' separation wall between LI and CC. Is it because LI can sometimes have more difficult uses that we would want to keep separated?

Ms. Bethel stated that was correct. Typically, the reasoning behind the separation fence requirement is to protect the Commercial from Industrial uses. The Industrial uses on the property to the west are enclosed and will not impact this site. This site was originally planned with the other development to the west and both were approved at the same time. The property to the west developed, although this one did not. A fence would not necessarily make sense since they will share access and interact with each other.

Vice Chair Bloomfield noted that we already know what the Light Industrial use is and if staff is okay with it, the Commission should be as well. He had no issues with the project and what is being requested.

Commissioner Cavenee asked if there were any concerns about cross-parking challenges with the restaurant use. He noted the evening hours for the commercial would work well with the Industrial use. Are there any cross-parking agreements in place?

Ms. Bethel stated there are currently no cross-parking agreements in place. On the development plan there is a section labeled for future cross access. During the Design Review phase, the applicant will need to pursue an Administrative Use Permit for the shared parking and will need to work with the other site as they are short about six spaces as currently proposed. That will be addressed in the Design Review phase.

Commissioner Cavenee asked if the void between the buildings was a courtyard.

Ms. Bethel stated the concept is for an open shared courtyard in the center of the retail and restaurant development.

Commissioner September noted this was a small parcel in an odd-shaped triangle which has a functional obsolescence. He was happy to see someone proposing a development on this parcel. From a setback perspective, he felt it was warranted to allow a little more flexibility on this parcel. He asked about the deviation for the front setback to 10' from the property line. He noted from the property line to the curb was another 29' of space. He asked if there were future plans for lane widening on Guadalupe Road or would that space remain for some time.

Ms. Bethel will need to research whether there were any CIP plans to expand that road. Typically, when a site is looking to develop, the town requests the amount of right-of-way that will allow for any type of future expansion that may be needed. That 29' right-of-way area may be more than what is actually required.

Commissioner Mundt liked the design and thought this strange little triangle was well-utilized. He liked that there is the nursery on the other side which gives that farm to table feel. He cautioned to have some additional lighting or other safety features to provide some indication of when trains are approaching, possibly integrated within the rail system.

4. GP19-08 THE CARSON: Request for Minor General Plan Amendment to change the land use classification of approx. 2.85 acres generally located south of the southwest corner of Gilbert Road and Civic Center Dr. from Shopping Center (SC) to Residential >14-25 DU/Acre land use classification.

Z19-20 THE CARSON: Request to rezone approximately 2.85 acres of real property generally located south of the southwest corner of Gilbert Rd. and Civic Center Dr. from Maricopa County Rural-43 (RU-43) to Multi-Family/Medium (MF/M) zoning district with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay. The effect of this rezone will be to allow residential development with modified development standards.

Chair Andersen declared a conflict with this item and left the dais.

Planner Keith Newman presented GP19-08 and Z19-20 The Carson, request for a General Plan Amendment and rezoning for 2.85 acres. There is a companion application for an annexation that will go before the Council shortly. The site is currently zoned Maricopa County Rural-43 (RU-43) and the applicant is proposing to go to Multi Family-Medium (MF/M). The General Plan designation is Shopping Center (SC) and the proposal is to change to Residential >14-25 DU/Acre. The proposed PAD overlay is to secure the overall site layout and design and a few deviations are being requested. The site is located at Gilbert Road west of the Public Safety Training Facility.

The development plan shows 10 to 12 proposed buildings with one main entrance off of Gilbert Road. The proposal is for 44 units with a density of 15.5 DU/Acre. The units range in size from 747 SF to a little over 1,300 SF, each with a two-car tandem garage.

The applicant is requesting PAD deviations per the table provided below:

Site Development Regulations	Required per LDC MF/M	Proposed MF/M PAD
Maximum Height (ft.)/Stories	40'	40'
Minimum Building Setbacks (ft.)		
Front	30'	20'
Side (Residential)	30'	13'

Side (Non-residential)	20'	10'
Rear (Non-residential)	20'	10'
Minimum Perimeter Landscape Area (ft.)		
Front	20'	20'
Side (Residential)	20'	10'
Side (Non-residential)	15'	10'
Rear (Non-residential)	20'	10'
Private Open Space (sq.ft./unit)	60'	60'
Common Open Space (Min.)	40% of net site	21.6% of net site
Separation between Buildings (ft.) Single or two story	20'	14'-4"

Staff has concerns with the deviation for the front building setback to 20' and the landscape setback to 20 feet. The justification for those requested setbacks is not clear and staff has asked for more information from the applicant. The applicant stated that due to the setback of the adjacent commercial developments with some of those buildings being set back 75' feet, they feel that is enough to justify reducing the setbacks along the perimeter to 10' because there is plenty of separation and buffer between the existing uses.

Along the south property line, there is an 18' easement owned by SRP. The applicant's justification along the south boundary is that there is ample room for a buffer because there is 30' to 35' of separation distance between their property and the residential boundaries because of the SRP easement. Staff was not too concerned on that deviation request.

The percentage of common open space is proposed at 21% with landscaping installed in the 18' SRP easement. Staff has asked the applicant to provide a letter from SRP stated they are acceptable to that request. Part of their justification for the deviation is that there will be a significant buffer to the residential to the south. Without that easement and without SRP's permission to place landscaping, staff would not be able to support that deviation. The applicant is proposing 21% common open space, when 40% is required, almost a 50% reduction. Staff's major concern is that the applicant is proposing private patio space as part of the landscape setback, which would greatly reduce the ability to provide plants and trees as a buffer from dissimilar uses.

A neighborhood meeting was held, although surprisingly, no one attended. Staff is requesting input from the Commission on the requested deviations and the overall design of the development.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION:

Commissioner Cavenee understood that there has been some trouble drawing commercial tenants due to the depth of the property. This has been dealt with by approving some higher density residential in back of this property, which seems to have worked out great. His concern was with giving up the Gilbert Road frontage for residential. From the big picture perspective, he is already hesitant to be on board with this proposal. All of the requested deviations draw him even further away from being enthused about this project. He was surprised that no neighbors came out to the meeting, especially with the easement against the residential. He would be interested to hear from the neighbors as these properties will be very close. He asked if there would be a separation wall between these townhomes and the residential.

Mr. Newman stated yes, there would be an 8' block wall.

Commissioner Cavenee asked what would be the benefit of landscaping 18' of alley. He felt there were too many deviations and the Gilbert Road frontage would not be the best place to give up on SC (Shopping Center) zoning. He was not sure how hard it is to lease this property to commercial, although he would be interested to hear the justification.

Commissioner Mundt echoed Commissioner Cavenee's sentiments. Due to the sheer magnitude and number of deviations being requested, he asked what consolations were actually being made. He felt putting landscape in an easement goes against the character of what the LDC was put into place for to some extent. Why wouldn't the homes have been able to do that? He asked what this parcel was in the past and what were some of the reasons it couldn't be sold.

Vice Chair Bloomfield felt Commissioner Mundt was asking about any prior activity on the site.

Mr. Newman stated to his knowledge, this is the first proposal and he was not aware of any previous development applications for this property.

Commissioner Mundt would like to see a better picture of the reasoning behind this proposal. He felt there was more work to be done.

Commissioner September asked if the open space calculations typically included private patios.

Mr. Newman stated they do not. Staff made the comment during the pre-app meeting that they were not supportive of including private patio space to meet the common open space percentage requirement.

Commissioner September noted this is a small parcel similar to the odd parcel in The Murphy presented earlier. He was glad to see someone take a shot at it. He liked this as a buffer to the single-family to the south. He shared a lot of the concerns with the reductions in open space and the setbacks to residential, and the Gilbert Road frontage.

Commissioner Simon shared the sentiments of the other members that this was possibly jumping in too quick to put residential on this site. He feared we would be missing an opportunity with the prime Gilbert Road frontage potential with the Town Center being there. He felt with time this could develop into something better and with some other potential infill projects in that area. This is a good-sized lot that could actually be used for something other than residential. He did not know that he would be in favor of the project as well as the restructuring and resizing of the setbacks and other requirements.

Commissioner Mundt asked if the 21% open space already included the patios.

Mr. Newman stated the applicant did include the patios in the open space percentage. The applicant is stating that they actually have over 40% open space, although they are using the proposed landscaping in the SRP easement to satisfy the common open space requirement. Staff is not in agreement with that. He was not sure what the open space requirement would be without the private patios. Staff has asked for clarification on that, but has not yet received any further information from the applicant.

Vice Chair Bloomfield believed the 21% was the base common open space, which jumps up to 43% when the private patios and SRP easement are included. He did not like the project for a number of reasons, including the setbacks. He might be okay with a setback reduction on the south, but not on Gilbert Road if this ended up being the use. It looks like there are opportunities for access into this parcel from the back from the parking lot, and with the frontage, it is very viable for a commercial use, even though it is a narrow and deep parcel. He was not largely in favor of this use. If it ends up being a residential use, he would not agree to a deviation on the setbacks along Gilbert Road. The project could lose a couple buildings to provide a little more open space and still be in the >14-25 DU/Acre, although it may not meet the open space required based on how staff wants it to be calculated. He was not in favor of private open space being counted in the common open space requirement. He felt staff was on the right track. The Commissioners have all expressed concerns regarding it being residential versus commercial on this site and Vice Chair Bloomfield concurred with that.

With no further discussion on this item, Chairman Andersen returned to the dais.

5. GP19-12 VAL VISTA SQUARE: Request for Minor General Plan Amendment to change the land use classification of approximately 9.1 acres of real property generally located southeast of the southeast corner of Val Vista Drive and Pecos Road from Regional Commercial land use

classification to Residential >25-50 DU/Acre land use classification. The effect of this amendment will be to change the plan of development for the property to allow residential development.

Z19-24 VAL VISTA SQUARE: Request to amend Ordinance Number 2380 pertaining to the Val Vista Square Planned Area Development (PAD) and to rezone approximately 34.1 acres of real property generally located southeast of the southeast corner of Val Vista Drive and Pecos Road approximately 34.1 acres of Regional Commercial (RC) all with a Planned Area Development overlay zoning district to approximately 25.0 acres of Regional Commercial (RC) and 9.1 acres of Multi-Family/High all with a Planned Area Development overlay zoning district.

Senior Planner Amy Temes presented the request for rezoning and General Plan Amendment for Val Vista Square. The site is located within the 202 Growth Area and the Val Vista Medical Growth Area in the General Plan. It is also in the Gilbert 202 Growth Area. That speaks to how much energy is in this area. This is one of the more intensive areas of the Town of Gilbert per the General Plan. This site is near large employment centers including Rivulon, the Motor Plex, Crossroads Town Center, Mercy Gilbert Hospital, Santan Village Marketplace as well as Santan Mall. This is very much an epicenter of contemporary Gilbert. Some of the highest volume of traffic in town is within this square mile area.

Last summer, there was some movement to bring in a more high-density zoning district to pair with the existing residential General Plan land use category of >25-50 DU/Acre, which has existed in the town for many years. The applicant is requesting a change from Regional Commercial to Residential >25-50. The only other such development is the Page Commons retirement community in downtown Gilbert. The rezoning would be from Regional Commercial with PAD to Multi Family-High with 35 DU/Acre.

Ms. Temes stated she had met Commissioner Cavenee who at the time was the applicant and owner representative for Main Street Commons. The Santan Mall beat the open-air concept to the punch and Main Street Commons did not develop as anticipated. This was the original development plan in that Planned Area Development at the time. It was a true mixed-use project with retail, food and beverage, hotels, offices, lofts and a theater. When the Main Street Commons did not develop and Park Corporation picked it up, they loved the site and the vision and felt it had great potential. The Veterans Administration Medical Clinic (VA) was one of the first Main Street properties to develop. Main Street runs from the 202 to Pecos Road and from Val Vista Road to the Costco and Winco. The Winco, Mountainside Fitness, the two hotels, as well as the new hotels that were just built were part of Val Vista Square, which is part of the rezoning. Those are still part of the Main Street Commons PAD. The idea was for retail and medical to go with the VA, with retail and food at the hard corner, which is one of the busiest corners in town, as well as hospitals, hotels and local office services. The idea is to keep it a mixed-use environment and to try to make it as intensive as possible. There were originally rights to 99 feet and another 119 feet with the tall buildings that were originally planned with this site. It is zoned Regional Commercial which is 55 feet, but the Vertical Overlay District could allow for additional height. When the Val Vista Square PAD went through, the development plan had connectivity and a unified streetscape and development pattern. At that time, a design guideline booklet was approved as well as a very complex master signage program, which provide a really good framework for this project. Today, the VA has been built at the southwest corner, one hotel is built and another is approved, and a mini hospital was approved. The recently approved Aldi has three years to pull a permit. Unison Bank exists to the north.

The proposal is for a mixed-use project with retail and food and beverage at the corner of Val Vista and Pecos, and offices, hotels and retail wrapping around the southeast area as it would be visible from the freeway. The concept adds residential into the middle with walkability to retail, food and beverage, office, and medical. High-density residential in the middle would fulfill a user group within the project that could act as a catalyst for growth in some of the other areas. The only modification being requested with this PAD is a reduction in open space. When Multi Family-High was brought forward last summer, staff felt it would land between 25% and 30% open space for a higher density dwelling unit project. The 40% is a lot and the applicant came in at 25% open space. The applicant is proposing no walls or fences and no gated parking. Because Multi Family is a standalone zoning district, this would need to go through a separation fence modification at the time of Design

Review as that is a buffer required by code. There may be an Administrative Use Permit for shared parking that is proposed on the street. This would fall under the existing Design Guidelines and Master Sign Program for this site. A neighborhood meeting was held with one business operator with Unison Bank in attendance, who was encouraged and happy about the development. The proposal is very similar to the layout of the original Main Street Commons site plan, which included a loft component as a potential use on the site. Staff is requesting input from the Commission regarding the General Plan Amendment within the central 202 Growth Corridor Area, the rezone to Multi Family-High in a horizontal mixed-use environment, and the overall footprint layout of the development plan.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION:

Commissioner Smith's first impression was that this was very similar to what is happening in Santan Village with the residential as a buffer. He liked the plan and felt the access in and out was very good with Pecos on one side and Market Street on the other. He was in favor of the requests.

Commissioner Cavenee felt it was wonderful to see this going forward. There was a high-rise or a very tall residential component to the original development. He felt that would be part of the magic of the development and would help feed a lot of the businesses that hopefully will come in as part of this and may in fact fuel the drive for more retail and restaurant. He asked since there would not be walls or fences, would there be underground parking.

Ms. Temes stated they are just starting to touch on that aspect on the actual layout of the site. The applicant thought they would just make the parking, although an Administrative Use Permit could be done if there needs to be shared guest parking. As a mixed-use project, staff is not opposed to that as some of the uses would be off-peak hours and would be very compatible. Staff is looking into those options.

Commissioner Cavenee asked if this would be pure residential without commercial use on the ground floor.

Ms. Temes stated Multi Family-High would not allow for a mixed-use environment.

Commissioner Cavenee was pleased to see that it is staying within most of the setback requirements. He was fine with the reduction in the landscaping because the intensity of the landscaping around the perimeter will create a very nice green approach to the site, especially the frontage, which is fortunately now 10 years more mature than when it was initially planned. He felt there was enough offset there to justify the internal being slightly less dense in landscaping.

Vice Chair Bloomfield was pleased to see this come forward and it sounds like staff was pleased with it as well. He was excited and felt it will serve as a catalyst for the area and will help to drive development. This is a prime time and we are seeing a lot of activity.

Commissioner Simon shared the previous sentiments and felt it looked like a great project. His only concern was that in a few years after this site is built out, we may see a recommendation for more multi-family on those empty spots.

Chair Andersen recessed the Study Session at 6:05 p.m. to convene the regular meeting of the Planning Commission.

The Study Session was reconvened at 6:26 p.m.

- 6. DR19-141 MCDONALD'S - MORRISON RANCH: Site plan, landscape, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, colors and materials, for approximately 1.05 acres, generally located on the northeast corner of Higley Road and Morrison Ranch Parkway, and zoned Shopping Center with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.**

Planner Josh Rogers presented DR19-141, McDonald's – Morrison Ranch. This site is within Morrison Ranch in an established shopping center, Lakeview Village. Staff has no concerns on the design or location. What is

brought forth today is exactly what was envisioned and approved in the original development plan back in 2002. This is the final pad within that development. After this parcel is developed, only parcels 6 and 7 will remain to be developed within this shopping center.

Staff requested in the first review comments to relocate an enclosure off of the Higley Road frontage to the back. The applicant was considering a location next to the drive-through, and after staff's comments, the applicant agreed to move it away from the Higley Road frontage. Most of the landscaping has been established with the main shopping center and the applicant will just be filling in with some landscaping on the site. Staff had no concerns with the elevation, although there were some questions regarding the rooflines. Staff has talked with the applicant and the Morrison architectural team and those issues have been resolved. The applicant will be introducing some small changes. Overall, everything matches what was planned for this shopping center. Staff is fully supportive and continues to work with the applicant. This item is being brought forth today as it is part of an approved Master Site Plan. It is under 5 acres and the LDC provides the ability to approve this proposal administratively and no public hearing is required. The Commission does have the option to direct that the matter go to Public Hearing. Staff is asking for general input from the Commission.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION:

Commissioner Smith liked the way it was phrased as adding a new development to an existing shopping center. He was glad to see this happening on this particular site. He asked for confirmation that there were no changes to the existing ingress and egress.

Mr. Rogers stated there are no changes whatsoever. The proposal is for just this pad.

Commissioner Cavenee commented that the car stacking queue seemed a little short and could back up into the drive aisle during busy times. He noted that the restaurant at Gilbert and Baseline has a short queue as well which is a problem at certain times, although they seem to have gotten over it. He was unsure if Traffic had weighed in on this proposal. He felt it was a pad building that is well-defined by historical architecture.

Mr. Rogers agreed that it was short and will make sure that is addressed.

Chair Andersen confirmed that the Commission was agreeable to have this item move forward to be approved administratively.

7. DR19-135 WATERMARK AT GILBERT TOWN SQUARE: Site plan, landscape, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, colors and materials, for approximately 10.32 acres, generally located south of the southeast corner of Gilbert Rd. and Civic Center Dr., and zoned Multi-Family/Medium (MF/M) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.

Planner Keith Newman presented DR19-135, Watermark at Gilbert Town Square. This project came forward several months ago for a General Plan Amendment and a rezone. The site is a little over 10 acres and is located just south of the Public Safety Complex on the east side of Gilbert Road. The site plan was reviewed with the General Plan Amendment and rezone and there are no changes to the actual site layout, locations of the building footprints, or the parking. The applicant is proposing 216 units in six apartment buildings with a density of 20.93 DU/Acre. The site is zoned Multi Family-Medium (MF/M). There is parking provided interior to the site as well as around the development with parking canopies and garage buildings along the perimeter. The majority of the landscaping is along the frontage of Gilbert Road and the landscape setback areas on the north and south sides. There is a generous landscape setback of approximately 80' on the east side facing the adjacent single-family residential. There are two amenity areas proposed. One is along the front half of the property with a clubhouse, office, swimming pool, ramadas, BBQ, and fire pits. The second amenity area is located towards the back of the development with a tot lot, fire pit and benches. Staff thought it was very important to have amenities that are accessible by everyone in the development. The buildings are all three stories. There are block walls along the north and south boundaries with a view fence along the eastern boundary next to the landscape tract. The intent is for an upgraded block wall along Gilbert Road with a monument sign. That has

not yet been provided in the design. The colors and materials are fairly standard with a lot of stone veneer, smooth-faced CMU and stucco.

Staff provided first review comments on the building elevations and the applicant has revised the elevations to address the articulation on the side elevations in between the tower elements. The applicant has added stucco frames and pop outs and eliminated some of the stone. Staff may ask that some of the stone be added back to the side elevations. Staff felt the applicant has done a much better job of dressing up the side elevations on the end cap of the buildings. Staff had also asked for the building entryways to be enhanced, and an additional main body material as well as enhanced colors. Staff felt the main body colors in Scheme 2 were too monochromatic. Elevations for the clubhouse/office and garage buildings were reviewed. Renderings were provided showing the new revised side elevations. Staff felt the wall was on the same plane as the towers and asked that it be inset to provide movement and more of a shadow line. The applicant has addressed those comments.

Staff asked for input from the Commission on the elevations, articulation, colors and materials.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION:

Chair Andersen asked if the applicant would be rebuilding the block wall.

Mr. Newman stated the applicant has tried to talk to the property owner to the south concerning that block wall. As of now, that wall will remain at 6' and we will see how cooperative the property owner to the south will be. The applicant is still working on that.

Commissioner Simon liked the use of this narrow, deep piece of land. He would prefer Scheme 1 over Scheme 2 and liked the oscillation of colors. He liked what the applicant did with the revised elevation.

Commissioner Cavenee liked both color schemes and would defer to the applicant. He felt the articulation was sufficient and there seems to be plenty of movement in the height of the buildings, the parapets, and with the façade. They did a great job in putting this together.

Chair Andersen noted there were no patio walls at the ground floor.

Mr. Newman stated staff had made that comment during first review and it has been revised. There are now walls for the ground floor patios.

Chair Andersen was concerned with the parking facing the patios and the lights shining down on those units. He was not a big fan of the pop outs on the ends of the buildings. He has seen those pop outs done in other apartment projects and felt it looked like an afterthought. The one-bedroom units on the end would have the living room wall on that side. He recommended putting in small 2 by 2 or 4 by 2 windows on that wall, which would give the pop outs some purpose, create articulation on the end of the building, and provide some natural light making the space more inviting.

8. DR19-136 FLOWER CHILD: Site plan, landscaping, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, and colors and materials for approximately 2 acres, generally located on the northwest corner of San Tan Village Parkway and Williams Field Road, and zoned Regional Commercial with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.

Planner Stephanie Bubenheim reviewed DR19-136 Flower Child. The two-acre site is located within the Gilbert Crossroad Planned Area Development. The land use development map for the Crossroads PAD was approved in 1999. The site is on the northwest corner of Santan Village Parkway and Williams Field Road adjacent to Firebirds and Living Spaces. The SanTan Village Mall has its own set of design guidelines, although we will focus on the character of the Santan Village Marketplace for this project. There is an existing right in/right out along Williams Field Road that the site will be using. The applicant is proposing another drive aisle access along Santan Village Parkway to connect with Firebirds and Living Spaces.

Staff is requesting input on the colors and materials, the relation to the existing Parcel A of the Crossroads PAD, and the movement and articulation of the west and north elevations. This site was approved under two ordinances and the ULDC, so the site development standards are different than what is typical for the Regional Commercial zoning district. The proposal does meet all of those site development standards. The Fox concept is for two restaurants, North Italia and Flower Child, that will share the same space. There will be two outdoor patio seating areas. The proposal meets the parking requirements under the Crossroad PAD. The indoor space is approximately 10,900 SF and the outdoor patio space is about 3,200 SF. The frontage along the right-of-ways follows the approved SanTan Village Parkway Right-of-Way Standards. Landscaping will be used to buffer between the two patio areas, although it is a shared space. There is a private dining room with a door to the outside and a door to North Italia. The colors and materials are mainly a white metal panel with a gray metal roof material. The accent colors are green for Flower Child and red for North Italia.

The applicant has provided updated elevations since the staff report was published. Ms. Bubenheim advised that if a mural incorporates anything that represents what is in the building, it will be considered as a sign and will need to be included in the signage allowances. If a mural has nothing to do with the business, staff will not review it. With the extensive use of the white metal panels across the building, staff is looking for input on providing more dimension or movement to the building. The Flower Child entrance on the east elevation has a lot of windows and a striped awning. The outdoor patio area for North Italia will have a permanent metal awning, while Flower Child will use umbrellas at the patio.

Staff had some concerns with the building being incorporated into the character of the area. Photos were provided of Top Golf, Living Spaces, Main Event, and Firebirds to show the colors and textures of the existing buildings in the area. The updated elevations were reviewed as to the revised mural area, which is subject to change depending on the chosen artist. Greenery elements have been added to the back side of the building as well as a cap to the top of the parapet. The entrance to the private dining area has been revised to incorporate black brick. An awning has been added over a door, a cap was added along the top of the parapet, and a third row of windows was added.

Staff is requesting input from the Commission on the colors and materials of the building, how it correlates with the area, and the movement or articulation of the elevations.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION:

Vice Chair Bloomfield felt his wife would love the elevations and colors. He liked the crisp, clean style. He noted the buildings in the area have the same stone and stucco, although the lighting casts them in a very different way. Almost every building in the area has its own unique character. He felt that front corner was a great spot to have a little splash of something different. If this meets all of the guidelines and requirements and the owner and developer agree to it, he would tend to be okay with the proposal as well. He appreciated the comments regarding a mural versus a sign. He appreciated that the applicant has already worked with staff to break it up and to work on the murals. He felt the north edge really needed something to break it up as there was a tremendous amount of white space. He liked how the greenery was added. He agreed with the proposed changes based on staff recommendations and appreciated that the applicant listened to staff's comments.

Commissioner Cavenee worked close to the Scottsdale Flower Child location and felt the architecture was simple with a nice light feel. He felt it will be a hit on this corner. He thought the simplicity of it is probably their theme. Because it is a themed restaurant, he felt there should be some flexibility. He shared some of the concern with the north and west elevations. He felt the applicant tried to articulate it slightly with the cap and did not know how much more they could do to make it fit. He would encourage another visit to see if there was a way to make it not quite so boxy perhaps by varying the parapet heights. The boxiness was the only thing that jumped out. Otherwise, he felt it was great.

Commissioner September mirrored Commissioner Cavenee's comments. He felt exactly the same way about this development.

Commissioner Mundt really liked the initial mural significantly more than the revised one that looks like spilled paint. He felt it would add significantly more character to have the flower mural.

Chair Andersen agreed regarding the mural and felt it tells the story better.

Ms. Bubenheim stated if the mural relates to the business, it would act as a sign and would be counted in the signage square footage. The revised version does not give any sense as to what is in the building, but is just art. Staff has no say on art and that is not counted toward the sign allowance. It would be up to the applicant whether to have the flower mural, although they would need to keep within the signage requirements. She noted that variances are not done for sign square footage.

Commissioner Mundt felt the flower mural would help to offset some of the concerns about the boxiness and would also provide interest at the corner.

Commissioner Cavenee agreed that the first mural was better. It would be nice to have that character.

Commissioner September suggested bubbles instead of flowers for the mural.

Ms. Bubenheim felt that would need to be reviewed by the Planning team as to whether bubbles would reference the child in Flower Child.

Commissioner Simon also liked the flower mural, although that elevation did seem boxy. He felt the articulation with the shrubs and the cap, along with the first mural would hit it out of the park.

Chair Andersen's only concern was the amount of metal on the building with the siding and roof. That gives it a strong industrial feel. He liked the design and thought it was a cool-looking building. He asked where the black brick was added.

Ms. Bubenheim pointed out the area that projects toward the center of the patio which was previously gray stucco. That has been upgraded to black brick to tie in with the Crossroads PAD.

Chair Andersen suggested introducing more of that brick in small sections around the building to break up the amount of metal paneling. They are breaking that up nicely with the large storefronts and the murals.

9. Discussion of Regular Meeting Agenda: This item was discussed during the regular meeting.

ADJOURN STUDY SESSION

With no further business before the Commission, Chair Andersen adjourned the Study Session at 7:02 p.m.

Brian Andersen, Chairman

ATTEST:

Dana Desing, Recording Secretary

TOWN OF GILBERT
PLANNING COMMISSION - REGULAR MEETING
Council Chambers
50 E. Civic Center Drive, Gilbert, AZ
November 6, 2019

COMMISSION PRESENT:

Brian Andersen, Chair
Carl Bloomfield, Vice Chair
David Cavenee
Noah Mundt
Scott September
Jän Simon
Les Smith
Nathan Mackin, Alternate

STAFF PRESENT:

Sydney Bethel, Planner II
Stephanie Bubenheim, Planner II
Keith Newman, Planner II
Josh Rogers, Planner II
Amy Temes, Senior Planner
Eva Cutro, Planning Division Manager
Nancy Davidson, Assistant Town Attorney

COMMISSION ABSENT:

Philip Alibrandi, Alternate

RECORDER:

Dana Desing

COUNCIL LIAISON:

Brigette Peterson, Absent

PLANNER	CASE	PAGE	VOTE
Sydney Bethel	DR19-132	2	Approved
Stephanie Bubenheim	DR19-133	2	Approved
Stephanie Bubenheim	GP19-07 / Z19-19	3	Approved
Keith Newman	UP18-42 PH50400A	5	Continued

CALL TO ORDER OF REGULAR MEETING

Chairman Brian Andersen called the Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 6:05 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All who were present recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Recording Secretary Dana Desing called the roll and determined that a quorum was present.

10. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Chair Andersen called for a motion to approve the agenda.

MOTION: Vice Chair Bloomfield moved to approve the Agenda as presented; seconded by Commissioner Cavenee. **Motion passed 7-0.**

COMMUNICATIONS

11. COMMUNICATION FROM CITIZENS:

At this time, members of the public may comment on matters within the jurisdiction of the Town but not on the agenda. The Commission's response is limited to responding to criticism, asking staff to review a matter commented upon, or asking that a matter be put on a future agenda.

There were no communications from citizens.

12. REPORT FROM COUNCIL LIAISON ON CURRENT EVENTS:

Councilmember Brigitte Peterson was not present.

PUBLIC HEARING (CONSENT)

All items listed below are considered the public hearing consent calendar. The Commission may, by a single motion, approve any number of items where, after opening the public hearing, no person requests the item be removed from the consent calendar. If such a request is made, the Commission shall then withdraw the item from the public hearing consent calendar for the purpose of public discussion and separate action. Other items on the agenda may be added to the consent calendar and approved under a single motion.

Chair Andersen read the list of Public Hearing (Consent) items and opened the Public Hearing. He asked if any members of the public wished to speak on those items. There were no requests to speak and the Public Hearing was closed.

13. DR19-132 CULVER'S FROZEN CUSTARD: Site plan, landscape, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, colors and materials, for approximately 2.3 acres, generally located at the southwest corner of Val Vista Drive and Willis Road, and zoned Regional Commercial (RC).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Approve the Findings of Fact and approve DR19-119, Culver's Frozen Custard: site plan, landscape, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, colors and materials for approximately 2.3 acres, generally located at the southwest corner of Val Vista Drive and Willis Road, and zoned Regional Commercial (RC), subject to conditions:

1. Construction of the project shall conform to the exhibits approved by the Planning Commission at the November 6, 2019 public hearing.
2. The construction site plan documents shall incorporate the Standard Commercial and Industrial Site Plan Notes adopted by the Design Review Board on March 11, 2004.
3. Signage is not included in this approval. Administrative Design Review approval is required prior to submitting for sign permit.
4. Grading and drainage revisions to accommodate future right-turn lane at Willis Road and Val Vista Drive shall be coordinated with Engineering during final Construction Document review / approval.
5. The width of the decel lane located on Val Vista Drive must be a minimum of 11'. A revised decel lane with a minimum width of 11' shall be incorporated into the Construction Document Submittal.

14. DR19-133 GILBERT SPECTRUM BUILDING 5: Site plan, landscape, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, colors and materials, for approximately 8.46 acres, generally located west of the southwest corner of McQueen and Elliot Roads, and zoned Light Industrial (LI) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Approve the Findings of Fact and approve DR19-133, Gilbert Spectrum Building 5: site plan, landscape, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, colors and materials for approximately 8.46 acres, generally located west of the southwest corner of McQueen and Elliot Roads and zoned Light Industrial (LI) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay, subject to conditions:

1. Construction of the project shall conform to the exhibits approved by the Planning Commission at the November 6, 2019 public hearing.
2. The construction site plan documents shall incorporate the Standard Commercial and Industrial Site Plan Notes adopted by the Design Review Board on March 11, 2004.
3. Two entry monument signs and one tenant sign were reviewed for location along Elliot Road as part of the Gilbert Spectrum Master Sign Program (MSP) and may proceed through sign permitting. All building signage must follow the MSP or an Administrative Design Review approval is required to amend the sign program before proceeding through sign permitting.
4. Prior to construction document (CD) submittal, the applicant shall provide Planning Staff with revised Site, Landscape, and Grading and Drainage plans to reflect the property line jog to meet landscape setback requirements along Elliot Road.
5. Upon completion of a signed Resolution for vacation of Right-of-Way along Elliott Road for a prior driveway entrance, the applicant may submit an Administrative Design Review to modify the landscape area and parking stalls in that portion of the project.
6. Parking screen wall along west property line north of drive aisle access shall be removed.
7. Recorded documentation of cross access agreements must be provided and shown on the Final Plat.

MOTION: Vice Chair Bloomfield moved to recommend approval of Consent Agenda Items 13. DR 19-132, Culver's Frozen Custard, and 14. DR 19-133, Gilbert Spectrum Building 5; seconded by Commissioner Mundt.

Motion passed 7-0.

PUBLIC HEARING (NON-CONSENT)

Non-Consent Public Hearing items will be heard at an individual public hearing and will be acted upon by the Commission by a separate motion. During the Public Hearings, anyone wishing to comment in support of or in opposition to a Public Hearing item may do so. Anyone who wishes to comment on a Public Hearing Item must fill out a public comment form indicating the Item Number on which they wish to be heard. Once the hearing is closed, there will be no further public comment unless requested by a member of the Commission.

Chair Andersen read the Public Hearing items.

Planner Stephanie Bubenheim advised that Item 17. UP18-42 was requested to be continued to the December 4, 2019 Public Hearing.

- 15. GP19-07 MEDICAL OFFICE: Request for Minor General Plan Amendment to change the land use classification of approx. 3.13 acres generally located at the southwest corner of Fiesta Boulevard and Baseline Road from Light Industrial to General Commercial. The effect of this amendment will be to allow medical office uses within an existing office building.**
- 16. Z19-19 MEDICAL OFFICE: Request to amend Ordinance No. 356 to remove approx. 3.13 acres generally located at the southwest corner of Fiesta Boulevard and Baseline Road from the Fiesta Tech Planned Area Development overlay zoning district (PAD) and to rezone said real property from Light Industrial (LI) zoning district with a PAD to General Commercial (GC) zoning district, as shown on the exhibit available for viewing in the Planning Services Division.**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- A. Recommend to the Town Council approval of GP19-07, to change the land use classification of approx. 3.13 acres, generally located at the southwest corner of Fiesta Boulevard and Baseline Road from Light Industrial (LI) to General Commercial (GC) land use classification; and
- B. For the following reasons: the development proposal conforms to the intent of the General Plan and can be appropriately coordinated with existing and planned development of the surrounding areas, and all required public notice and meetings have been held, the Planning Commission moves to recommend approval of Z19-19, rezoning approx. 3.13 acres within the Fiesta Tech Planned Area Development (PAD) and generally located at the southwest corner of Fiesta Boulevard and Baseline Road from approx. 3.13 acres of Light Industrial (LI) zoning district with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay to approx. 3.13 acres of General Commercial (GC) zoning district with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay, subject to the following conditions:
 - a. Dedication to Mesa for Baseline Road rights-of-way that are adjacent to the Property shall be completed prior to or at the time of recordation of the final plat or sooner as required by the Town Engineer. Failure to complete dedication prior to the effective date of this ordinance may result in reversion of the zoning to the prior zoning classification.
 - b. Dedication of Baseline Road to City of Mesa shall extend 65 feet from the monument line or as otherwise determined by the City of Mesa.
 - c. Construction of off-site improvements to Fiesta Boulevard adjacent to the Property required by Gilbert shall be completed prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy or final approval of any building constructed on the Property, or at the time requested by Gilbert, whichever is earlier.
 - d. Construction of off-site improvements to Baseline Road adjacent to the Property as required by the City of Mesa. Said improvements to Baseline Road shall be completed prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy or final approval of any building constructed on the Property, unless at a later time is approved by the Mesa City Engineer.
 - e. Should the Property include any landscaping, open space, private street, utilities or other facilities held in common ownership (collectively “common areas”) as described in Article 4.9 of the Land Development Code, Developer shall create a Property Owner’s Association (POA) at the time of final plat recordation or earlier if required by the Town Engineer for the maintenance and operation of said common areas.

Chair Andersen opened the public hearing and invited staff to make a presentation.

Planner Stephanie Bubenheim presented GP19-07 and Z19-19, Medical Office. The site is located at the southwest corner of Fiesta Boulevard and Baseline Road in the northwest corridor area. The site is 3.13 acres and is currently zoned and General Plan classified as Light Industrial. There is an existing office building on the site which is part of the Fiesta Tech Planned Area Development that was approved in the 1980s. The applicant is requesting a rezone and Minor General Plan Amendment to reclassify this area as General Commercial. The main reason for this request is to allow medical office uses within the building, which are currently not allowed in Light Industrial. There is a tenant that wishes to locate into this site. This does fall under the town’s economic development goals and policies to attract high-wage jobs and to retain growth. This area is a bit older and retaining the medical office use will help to revitalize the building and fill the space. Medical employment is one of the targeted industries that economic development strives to continue to bring into Gilbert. The site is adjacent to General Commercial to the west so it is compatible with the area. To the north is the City of Mesa and a Walmart. The areas to the east and south are part of the Fiesta Tech Planned Area Development. The adjacent uses are office buildings as well so this is not a new use in the area.

The applicant is requesting that the site to be removed from the Fiesta Tech Planned Area Development and be rezoned to General Commercial. The applicant is not requesting any modifications or deviations to the site

other than interior tenant improvements. Given the existing building on the site, any future modifications or expansions will need to follow the current General Commercial development standards in the LDC.

Staff recommends approval to the Town Council. There are typical conditions with zoning ordinances regarding the right-of-way. There is a 10' wide strip of land that is located in the City of Mesa. Within that strip of land along Baseline Road there are variations between 65' and 75' of that right-of-way, and staff has conditioned that the applicant work with the City of Mesa to complete that. As there is only one owner currently, that owner would be required to maintain the landscape on the site. If for any reason this site were to become condo units in the future, a property owners' association would need to be created. This item is scheduled to go before Town Council on December 5, 2019. The applicant is in attendance to address any questions.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION:

Commissioner Cavenee noted that on Google maps there is a Medical Arts LTC Pharmacy existing on the site. He wondered if this was a different type of medical use or if it would be a retroactive action.

Ms. Bubenheim stated that is a pharmacy office use. It was her understanding that the user looking to come onto the site is not a use that is currently on the site. The applicant, Adam Baugh, can elaborate.

Chair Andersen invited the applicant to make a presentation.

Adam Baugh, Withey Morris PLC, stated this is a great opportunity to bring a medical employer with an existing presence in the Town of Gilbert and who desires to relocate the majority of their higher-end services to the town. The uses existing on the site today will remain, and the medical employer will fill the vacant space in the existing building. No modifications are required. This proposal fits with the long-range vision of the town. At the end of the day, it will continue to be an office building. This will just add a medical use in addition to the compounding pharmacy and engineering office that are there currently.

Chair Andersen asked if any members of the public wished to speak on this item. There were none and Chair Andersen closed the Public Hearing.

With no further discussion from the dais, Chair Andersen called for a motion.

MOTION: Vice Chair Bloomfield moved to recommend to Town Council approval of GP19-07, a Minor General Plan Amendment; seconded by Commissioner September. **Motion passed 7-0.**

MOTION: Vice Chair Bloomfield, for the reasons set forth in the staff report, moved to recommend approval to Town Council for Z19-19, as requested, subject to the conditions listed in the staff report; seconded by Commissioner Mundt. **Motion passed 7-0.**

- 17. UP18-42 PH50400A-ADOT SAN TAN: Request to approve a Conditional Use Permit within a 600 square foot lease area generally located at the southwest corner of Williams Field Road and the 202 Freeway within the ADOT right-of-way to permit a Wireless Communication Facility (65 foot high) in the Public Facility/Institutional (PF/I) zoning district.**

This item was requested to be continued to December 4, 2019.

MOTION: Vice Chair Bloomfield moved to continue UP18-42: PH50400A, ADOT San Tan, to the December 4, 2019 Public Hearing; seconded by Commissioner Smith. **Motion passed 7-0.**

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

- 18. Planning Commission Minutes** - Consider approval of the minutes of the Study Session and Regular Meeting of October 2, 2019.

MOTION: Vice Chair Bloomfield moved to approve the minutes of the Study Session and Regular Meeting of October 2, 2019; seconded by Commissioner Mundt.

Motion passed 6-0, with Chair Andersen abstaining as he was not present at last month's meeting.

COMMUNICATIONS

19. Report from Chairman and Members of the Commission on current events: None.

20. Report from Planning Services Manager on current events:

Planning Services Manager Eva Cutro reported that the draft of the General Plan is posted online. It is in the 60-day review period. Staff is compiling the comments from residents, adjacent communities, and regional agencies at this time. The 60-day review period will end December 6, 2019.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business before the Planning Commission, Chair Andersen adjourned the Regular Meeting at 6:18 p.m.

Brian Andersen, Chairman

ATTEST:

Dana Desing, Recording Secretary